

Remarks

The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

Claim Amendments

The claims have been amended to improve the form thereof. The amendments are not being made to limit the claims in response to the prior art rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103

In the Office Action the Examiner contends the claims are unpatentable over US 6,482,510 (Rajan) in view of US 4,568,403 (Egan) and/or US 6,030,118 (Schneider).

Rajan provides a "novel form construction comprising a substrate ... and a release surface portion ... with a pressure-sensitive adhesive" (Rajan, abstract). In agreement with the examiner we perceive that Rajan, however, does not disclose the feature, characterized in that the print medium is formed as a cash point roll".

The rejection is improper since none of the references disclose or suggest a modular information system comprising, inter alia, a cash point roll, aka a cash register point of sale roll. The Examiner has acknowledged this in connection with Rajan, but contends that Egan discloses this feature at column 3, lines 18-35. This passage reads as follows:

Another aspect is to provide such a laminated member which includes two sheets of transparent plastic that are releasably joined by pressure and heat without any adhesive to provide a bonding force therebetween which is greater than the bonding force between the layer of pressure-sensitive adhesive and release backing sheet but less than the bonding force between the pressure-sensitive adhesive and most surfaces on which the laminated member is attached so that the two sheets of plastic can be separated with one side of the removed portion being covered by one of the transparent plastic sheets to exposed printed indicia thereon and with the other plastic sheet remaining on the surface to which the laminated member had been attached to cover the pressure-sensitive adhesive, thereby eliminating any adhesive being exposed on either the separated or remaining portions of the laminated member.

Completely lacking is any mention of a cash point roll. While Egan mentions elsewhere that "die-cut laminated members" (column 1, line 36), e.g. "credit cards" or "membership cards" (column 1, lines 22-30), may be fabricated from rolls of special plastic material, e.g. "... sheets of transparent plastic ... supplied from rolls" (column 5, lines 51 and 52), these members are distinctly different from cash point rolls.

Moreover, Rajan cannot render this feature obvious. Rajan relates to a "...form construction with a signage such as a sticker in which an additional liner ... is eliminated" (column 1, lines 48-50). Rajan addresses a problem in the context of supplying registration stickers for automobiles (column 1, lines 18-24) which is completely different from the problem addressed by applicant. Thus, a person skilled in the art would in view of Rajan, which deals with complex validation stickers, not find it obvious to use a "cash point roll" as a simple and effective method to guide a user's attention towards the content of information carriers.

For at least the foregoing reasons the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The dependent claims recite still further features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the applied references in a combination similar to that claimed.

Claim 3, for instance, specifies the bonding element is formed as a bonding film, which at least in part forms an information communicating symbol. The portion of Rajan referenced by the Examiner in respect of claim 3 states "... a signage article having indicia thereon" As can be seen in Figs. 7-9 of Rajan, the print layer 82 (referring to Rajan, Figs. 7 and 8) providing "indicia" resides on top of the signage article and is clearly distinct from the bonding element 46. Thus, Rajan does not disclose a bonding element having an information communicating symbol.

With regard to claim 7, Rajan also fails to disclose a bonding film of "visible but at the same time transparent material, so that additional information is visible on the backside of the cash point roll". The section referred to by the Examiner discloses that "... layer 82 may serve as a cover layer/clear coat." Referring to Fig. 7 of Rajan, it is immediately evident that this clear coat 82 is the print layer which is clearly distinct from the bonding element 46.

Moreover, Rajan fails to disclose a system according to claim 1 "wherein the information carrier comprises an envelope format of 22cm x 11cm". The text referenced by the Examiner does not mention any document formats.

Rajan also fails to disclose a system according to claim 12 "wherein the bonding element is formed as a magnetically and/or electrostatically loaded area of the printable sections". The section of Rajan text referenced by the Examiner refers to "[e]lectrostatic printing", "[i]on deposition printing" or "[m]agnetographics" as example printing processes for printing on printable surfaces. However, Rajan fails to disclose the usage of the magnetic/electrostatic loading of the printable section as a bonding element.

The absence in this reply of any comments on the other contentions set forth in the Office Action should not be construed to be an acquiescence therein. Rather, no comment is needed since the rejections should be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Don W. Bulson/

By _____
Don W. Bulson, Reg. No. 28,192

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

M:\B\BARD\IP\0137\IP0137US-R01.doc